

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

MEETING NAME	MINUTES PREPARED BY:	DATE PREPARED
Monthly Status Meeting / Process Improvement Meeting	Steve Hancock – Change Management Team	10/25/01

#### Participants

PARTICIPANT	COMPANY
Valerie Cottingham	BST - CCP
Cheryl Storey	BST - CCP
Brenda Files	BST - CCP
Steve Hancock	BST - CCP
Marva Goff	BST
Brenda Wallace	BST
Peggy Rehm	NightFire
Mary Conquest	ITC Deltacom
Shamone Stapler	ITC Deltacom
Dale Donaldson	epb
Paul Pennick	Birch Telecom
Mel Wagner	Birch Telecom
Jackie Sheehan	KPMG Consulting
Tami Swensen	Launch-Now-Accenture
John Duffey	FL-PSC
Beverly Lockwood	BTI
Bob Buerosse	Allegience Telecom
Beverly Estes	CommSouth
Lidia Ortega	CommSouth
Ranae Clark	Espire
Carl Larson	dset
Meena Masih	BST
Blanche Lafavor	BST

PARTICIPANT	COMPANY
Louise Wilds	Access Integrated
Sandy Evans	Sprint
Kim Gillette-Hoskins	Quintessent
Doyle Mote	BST
Peggy Rubino	ZTel
Butch Stahlberger	XO
Bill Grant	Telcordia for Sprint
Kyle Kopytchak	Network Telephone
Colette Davis	Covad
Karen Schaffner	WorldCom
Gloria Melvin	NuVox
Fred Brigham	Worldcom
Tyra Hush	Worldcom
Quam Nguya	KMC
Bernadette Seigler	AT&T
Susan Greider	BST
Sandra Cook	Marietta Fibernet
Chris Drake	Marietta Fibernet
Lorraine Watson	Worldcom
Nancy Welsh	Espire
Steve Taff	Allegience Telecom
Gary Romanick	BST
Dennis Davis	BST

#### Meeting Information History

DATE	START TIME	END TIME
10/24/01	9:00 PM EDT	4:00 PM EDT

MEETING PURPOSE / AGENDA
Monthly Status / CCP Process Improvement Meeting

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
1. OPENING	<p>Brenda Files (BST Change Management Team) opened the meeting and covered the items we were to accomplish during this meeting:</p> <p><b>OPEN DISCUSSION - CHANGE CONTROL PROCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Section 7 - Retirement of Versions Clarification</li><li>• Appendix D Changes - BST Versioning Policy for Industry Standard Order Interfaces</li><li>• Companion Coding Document</li><li>• Sizing Issue - CR0501</li><li>• Prioritization of Change Requests<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Prioritize by release schedule</li><li>○ Prioritize face-to-face or remote</li><li>○ Process for prioritization of change requests</li><li>○ AT&amp;T's Spreadsheet regarding CR Analysis</li></ul></li><li>• Format of CCP Meetings (face-to-face vs. conference call)</li><li>• Appeal Process - New CR's</li><li>• Review outstanding action items</li></ul> <p><b>MONTHLY STATUS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Regulatory Issues</li><li>• Status of Change Requests:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- New (CR's received after 9/26/01 to be presented by originators)</li><li>- Pending, Candidate Requests, Scheduled, Implemented, Canceled, Defects, Expedites</li></ul></li><li>• Report of System Outages</li><li>• Release Management &amp; Implementation Status</li><li>• Issues/Action Items</li><li>• Summarize New Action Items &amp; Assign Owners</li></ul>
2. OUTSTANDING ACTION ITEMS	<p>Update on outstanding Action Items from our 9/26/01 meeting:</p> <p><b>ACTION ITEM (BellSouth) (CLOSED)</b> BellSouth to provide a "draft" of the proposed Coding matrix that BellSouth is preparing as a companion to the BBR-LO.</p> <p><i>Status:</i> Draft Coding Matrix provided 10-18-01.</p>

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p><b>ACTION ITEM (BellSouth) (OPEN)</b> BellSouth to investigate User Requirement documentation not giving enough details needed to code from.</p> <p><i>Status:</i> BellSouth is still considering the concerns of the CLEC community and looking at ways to support the requests.</p>
	<p><b>ACTION ITEM (BellSouth) (CLOSED)</b> BellSouth Release Manager to provide a lower level project plan for a Release once a Release cycle has begun in order to capture all of the activity.</p> <p><i>Status:</i> BellSouth has agreed to provide this going forward.</p>
	<p><b>ACTION ITEM (BellSouth) (CLOSED)</b> BellSouth CMT to coordinate a conference call to further address CR0444-Provide Confirmation on Disconnect Orders/LNP and billing notifications.</p> <p><i>Status:</i> Subsequent to 8/22/01 meeting, NuVox requested a face-to-face meeting on CR0444 and CR0448. Meeting was held on 10/08/01.</p>
	<p><b>ACTION ITEM (BellSouth) (OPEN)</b> BellSouth to investigate if User Groups can be established for LENS and TAG.</p> <p><i>Status:</i> Currently being investigated.</p>
	<p><b>ACTION ITEM (BellSouth) (OPEN)</b> BellSouth to change the CAVE testing start date on the Release Schedule for 10.3 from 12/08/01 to 12/10/01.</p> <p><i>Status:</i> This change did appear on the monthly release management report and will be on the next update of the 2001 Project Plan for Release 10.3.</p>
	<p><b>ACTION ITEM (BellSouth) (CLOSED)</b> BellSouth will investigate the feasibility of making available a meeting calendar on the web site.</p> <p><i>Status:</i> The calendar is now available on the Interconnection and CCP websites.</p>
	<p><b>ACTION ITEM (BellSouth) (CLOSED)</b> BellSouth will investigate a request to invite the Account Team to participate in the CCP meetings to ensure that they are aware of all CLEC issues.</p> <p><i>Status:</i> Account Teams have been extended an invitation to participate in the monthly CCP meetings.</p>
	<p><b>ACTION ITEM (BellSouth) (CLOSED)</b> The CLECs will send suggestions/comments on BellSouth's Versioning Policy by October 3, 2001 to be discussed at the October 24, 2001 Monthly Status Meeting.</p> <p><i>Status:</i> Comments received from two (2) CLECs and were forwarded to BST SME for review.</p>
<b>3. OPEN DISCUSSION</b>	

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p><b>SECTION 7 - RETIREMENT OF VERSIONS CLARIFICATION</b></p> <p>Valerie Cottingham discussed the proposed "lanaguage" that was included in Ballot #7.</p> <p>Tyra Hush (MCI) asked if this definition is for all interface versions or just the TAG interface. Valerie explained that currently the only applicable interface is TAG. Going forward, new interfaces that are introduced will be included in this section as appropriate. Blanche Lafavor (BST) also clarified that this section is dealing with the expiration of a specific release, not an industry map expiration.</p> <p>Tyra Hush asked if a "real" example could be included in this section to clarify the issue.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth to provide a "real" example of the expiration of a TAG release with version numbers in the "Retirement of Versions" section of the CCP document. Text will be added to include that this expiration is not an "industry map".</p>
	<p><b>APPENDIX D CHANGES - BST VERSIONING POLICY FOR INDUSTRY ORDERING INTERFACES</b></p> <p>Brenda Wallace (BST) discussed BellSouth's proposed changes.</p> <p>Tyra Hush (MCI) stated that BellSouth mentions that it will provide a 6 month notice, but does not indicate when the older version will be sunset. Brenda Wallace explained that the sunset would occur on the implementation date of the new version. Tyra Hush also asked BellSouth to explain if any changes would be made to a "frozen map". Brenda Wallace explained that changes to a frozen map will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. This would include correction of defects or regulatory mandates. Tyra Hush asked if this could be added into the policy. Brenda Wallace explained that BellSouth policy would not allow any change to the "language". Worldcom and Telcordia expressed their opposition to this current policy.</p> <p>Bernadette Seigler (AT&amp;T) expressed its opposition as well, especially since BellSouth has verbally committed to this. Brenda Wallace agreed to present these concerns to BellSouth Legal to evaluate.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth to investigate if it can include language in the Versioning policy re: evaluation of changes to a frozen map, such as correction of defects and regulatory changes.</p>

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p>Mel Wagner (Birch) asked who would be responsible for adding any changes to a frozen version. Brenda Wallace explained that she is the Project Manager for Industry Releases and would be responsible for the decision to add such changes.</p> <p>Meena Masih (BST) explained that the BellSouth IT organization would follow the BellSouth policy with regard to any changes to a frozen version through an Interdepartmental Team.</p> <p>Dennis Davis (BST) also added that these types of changes constitute a "business decision" that BellSouth will or will not agree to implement; in other words, it is not a "one department" decision.</p> <p>Peggy Rehm (Nightfire) asked if there will be SUPPS allowed after LSOG2 is retired. Brenda Wallace explained that after the retirement of LSOG2, all action on LSOG2 would cease and no SUPPS would be allowed.</p> <p>Bernadette Seigler (AT&amp;T) asked if this would be the normal transition period for these LSOG retirements. Brenda Wallace explained that the Change Control Process document details the retirement "language" in Appendix D and currently BellSouth is not prepared to put this into the policy, however will consider.</p>
	<p><b>LSOG5/ELMS5</b></p> <p>Brenda Wallace (BST) explained to the CLECs that the current requirements for LSOG5/ELMS5 have now been reviewed, however due to the complexity of this work effort, BellSouth will need to make an adjustment to the implementation date. Brenda went on to explain that BellSouth would like to implement ELMS6 tentatively in March, 2003. This would include any changes that are currently in the scope of the ELMS5 requirements. BellSouth will communicate this change to the CLEC community via Carrier Notification.</p> <p>Bill Grant (Telcordia) asked when the requirements could be provided for this change surrounding the March, 2003 timeline. Valerie Cottingham explained that these will be provided in accordance to the revised Release Schedule.</p> <p>Meena Masih (BST) explained that internal discussions are still being held on this issue and BellSouth realizes that it will require an adjustment of the release schedules. Meena explained that because of this decision, BellSouth has a 10-week delay in the 10.3.1 schedule. This will be explained to the CLECs. Meena also reiterated that Release 10.3 is still on schedule.</p> <p>Peggy Rehm (Nightfire) asked if BellSouth could introduce part of the current ELMS5 functionality into TCIF9 even though the schedule and decisions have been changed. Brenda Wallace explained that some functionality that is ELMS5 related is in TCIF9 now. Peggy Rehm asked if any sub-loop processes could be added. Brenda Wallace explained that sub-loops will be in ELMS6, and also will be bringing in Line Splitting and Line Sharing (i.e., TOS of R and TOS of P in the LSR Authorization Fields).</p>

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p>Paul Pennick (Birch) asked BellSouth if there are proposed requirements for those releases that are forthcoming. Meena Masih (BST) explained that this would be addressed in the Release Schedule updates.</p> <p>Tyra Hush (MCI) asked when BellSouth would notify the CLEC community of the ELMS5/ELMS6 decision. Brenda Wallace explained that a Carrier Notification Letter will be processed and should be posted on the web within a 10 day period.</p> <p>Butch Stahlberger (XO) asked if there would be a combination of ELMS5 and ELMS6 or just skip ELMS5 altogether. Brenda Wallace again reiterated that all ELMS5 functionality will be included in ELMS6.</p> <p>Berndette Seigler (AT&amp;T) questioned that since ELMS5 implementation has changed, would BellSouth open up the opportunity for CLEC Change Requests to be worked. Dennis Davis (BST) explained that this is BellSouth's intention.</p> <p>Kim Gillette-Hoskins (Quintessent) asked how the ELMS5/ELMS6 decision affects the current draft requirements. Brenda Wallace explained that the current requirements will be utilized in the ELMS6 requirements. The decision may depend on other releases that would be going in prior to this deployment. Mel Wagner (Birch) asked if the CLECs would be getting more functionality in ELMS6 rather than ELMS5. Brenda Wallace stated that plans are to include unbundled DID, advanced hunting, partial migration enhancements, sub-loops for pre-ordering and ordering, line sharing, line splitting, E911 in addition to the current ELMS5 enhancements. Brenda also stated that this information is available on the Industry website.</p>

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p><b>"REVISED" 2002 RELEASE SCHEDULE</b></p> <p>Meena Masih (BST) presented an overview of the Revised 2002 Release Schedule. She indicated that there would be 3 major and 2 minor releases.</p> <p>Kyle Kopytchak (Network Tel) asked how the CLECs would know when BellSouth is delayed in meeting its implementation date and when would this be communicated to the CLECs. BellSouth replied that any delay in a release implementation date is communicated to the CLECs via Change Control.</p> <p>Colette Davis (Covad) suggested that the schedule show dependencies such as ELMS6, cost, or resources. Meena Masih explained that the schedule had to be modified in order for BellSouth to maintain its current commitment of 3 major and 2 minor releases. The delay is due to the length of the release cycles. In addition, Meena emphasized that due to the complexity of work effort for ELMS5, the overall schedule was impacted.</p> <p>Bill Grant (Telcordia) expressed concern that since this schedule has changed, it is causing baseline requirements to be provided 9 weeks later than in the previous schedule. Meena Masih explained that since BellSouth committed to provide a 12 month release schedule, it must give an overall picture of how many releases can be provided, although the content of each release is not determined until the release package meetings.</p> <p>Mel Wagner (Birch) reiterated that the example of the ELMS5 scope size issue only intensifies the need for sizing to be explained to the CLECs in order for Change Control prioritization to work.</p> <p>Meena Masih asked the CLECs to review the new schedule and provide any feedback by COB 10/26/01.</p> <p>Bill Grant and Tyra Hush questioned if user requirements could be provided earlier in shorter cycles.</p> <p>Bernadette Seigler (AT&amp;T) expressed concern about BellSouth providing quality code.</p> <p>The CLECs officially asked that BellSouth not use the presented revised release schedule but instead return to the original release cycle schedule. Meena Masih stated that with the original release schedule, we may or may not get a 3<sup>rd</sup> major release next year. The CLECs also asked that an additional minor release be added, replacing a major release.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth will re-construct the 2002 schedule on the original release cycles and communicate back to the CLECs.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth will investigate if it can offer another minor release replacing a major release in the 2002 Release Schedule.</p>

**October 24, 2001****CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting  
MEETING MINUTES**

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p><b>COMPANION CODING DOCUMENT</b></p> <p>Doyle Mote (BST) explained that a meeting was held in February, 2001 between the documentation team and a CLEC Sub-team to look at how the BBR-LO is currently being used. The decision was made to offer a "companion" document in a matrix/grid format to assist with CLECs' coding efforts. BellSouth has now provided a "draft" companion document and is interested in any comments from the CLECs on the format.</p> <p>Bill Grant (Telcordia) asked how this document would be shared. Doyle Mote explained that this would be posted in conjunction with the BBR-LO as a companion document at the same time. Two versions of this document would need to be maintained: a current one posted as well as a new version associated with an upcoming release. In the companion document, only those items that are changing would be reflected in an updated table and the previous document would be re-capped. Archived documents would also be maintained. BellSouth is also investigating how it would capture the "revision history". In addition, BellSouth plans to provide the first version of the companion document in the December, 2001 timeframe.</p> <p>Bill Grant stated that the conditional notes are needed. Doyle Mote indicated that the conditions reside in the Data Element Dictionary. BellSouth is trying to keep the companion document as simple as possible.</p> <p>Peggy Rehm (Nightfire) indicated her concern about the fields that are currently in the required field but are conditional. Doyle Mote asked Peggy to send examples.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> The CLECs request that a "revision history" be included in the BBR-LO companion matrix/grid document.</p>
	<p>Doyle Mote (BST) also reiterated to the CLECs that the User Requirements, TAG API, etc. should be used as "coding documents", not the BBR-LO.</p> <p>Tyra Hush (MCI) asked that a meeting be scheduled to discuss the BBR-LO companion matrix document with the BST documentation team.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth will schedule a meeting with the CLECs to discuss the BBR-LO companion matrix document on October 31, 2001 at 10:00 am EST.</p>
	<p>Peggy Rehm (Nightfire) asked if BellSouth has any plans to release the BBR-LO and make it effective with the new Release dates. She further explained that BellSouth should release new Business Rules and make them effective with the Release date, and not incorporate these changes in the current posted document. Peggy also asked that BellSouth maintain a current BBR-LO which would reflect the current production environment. Any documentation defects that are discovered would be incorporated into the posted document. Also, the updated business rules document would be shared with the CLECs prior to the upcoming release that it reflects.</p> <p>Bill Grant (Telcordia) expressed concerns that the Pre-Order Business Rules document currently does not provide a revision history.</p> <p>The CLECs indicated that they support this companion document.</p>



October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth to investigate providing a revision history in the Pre-Order Business Rules document.</p>
	<p><b>SIZING ISSUE - CR0501</b></p> <p>Cheryl Storey (BST) provided the status of CR0501 – Joint CLEC Proposed Sizing Process. The Change Request is divided into two sections: 1) Provide small, medium and large by units by CR. BellSouth has indicated that it can support Part 1. The second part of the CR associated with providing the number of units in each release is still under investigation.</p> <p>Dennis Davis indicated that he is working on a sizing model that he hopes will address Part 2 of CR0501.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> Dennis Davis to provide BellSouth’s sizing modeling concept to the CLECs within 2 weeks.</p>
	<p><b>PRIORITIZATION OF CHANGE REQUESTS</b></p> <p>BellSouth Change Management Team stated that a CLEC commented in a previous meeting that maybe we should prioritize by the release schedule instead of on a quarterly basis. BellSouth recommends that prioritization continue on a quarterly basis rather than per release schedule because this is in sync with the internal BellSouth change management process.</p> <p>Fred Brigham (MCI) commented that the CLECs should explore having prioritization every month during the CCP Monthly Status Meetings.</p> <p>Bernadette Seigler (AT&amp;T) pointed out that the real issue is getting Change Requests committed for delivery. In addition, she emphasized that it is critical that the CLECs prioritize around the BellSouth internal integration prioritization timeline which is quarterly.</p> <p>Bill Grant commented that it didn’t matter when we prioritize. The issue was that the contents of a release are not provided until a certain number of weeks prior to a release. BellSouth indicated that we can continue this discussion once the sizing modeling concept has been provided. BellSouth also asked the CLECs to think about the process we should use to prioritize new pending CR’s and subsequently move into the master list.</p> <p>Kyle Kopytchak (Network Tel) asked BellSouth to explain how Change Requests and defects get addressed internally with SMEs or other experts. Kyle also stated that there have been certain change requests that BellSouth has not supported, that were not fully understood internally within BellSouth (i.e., CR0424). Valerie Cottingham explained that we provide SMEs at status meetings to discuss concerns surrounding a CR. She directed Kyle to the CCP document, Section 4.0, Step 3 where a CLEC may request a SME at the next Status meeting. Brenda Files (BST) also reiterated that a CLEC may request a SME to participate in any monthly status meeting by sending an email to Change Control with their request.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth to provide a SME at the next monthly status meeting to support BellSouth’s position on CR0424.</p>

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p><b>AT&amp;T's SPREADSHEET REGARDING CR ANALYSIS</b></p> <p>Cheryl Storey explained to the CLECs that BellSouth had reviewed and responded to the CR Analysis provided to Change Control from AT&amp;T.</p> <p>BellSouth pointed out that the total # of implemented CR's = 189. Of the 189, 117 are Type 6 defects. In 2000, there were 49 defects (41 system and 8 documentation). In 2001, there were 68 defects (37 documentation and 31 system). The breakdown of the 189 implemented CR's is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type 2 - 7</li> <li>• Type 4 - 33</li> <li>• Type 5 - 32</li> <li>• Type 6 - 117</li> </ul> <p>Bernadette Seigler (AT&amp;T) expressed concern that BellSouth needs to deliver a quality product. Bernadette indicated that it is frustrating that CR's are not delivered. She also stated her concerns of how Implemented Change Requests are presented on the CCP website and expressed her distaste for how BellSouth included defects in the number of CLEC initiated requests that have been implemented. She also commented that all changes were not captured on the BellSouth Release Schedule posted on the CCP website. Valerie Cottingham commented that BellSouth was merely providing a breakdown of the implemented CR's.</p> <p>BellSouth stated that the intent of the Release Schedule posted on the web was to capture changes associated with a software release. Documentation and Process changes are not reflected on this schedule.</p> <p>Bernadette Seigler (AT&amp;T) stated that the current tools Change Control is using to produce the "Log" is not CLEC friendly and requested a better way to provide reports. The preference would be an EXCEL spreadsheet format.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth to investigate how the Change Request reporting format can be changed to create reports to be used as tracking tools.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth to add an "actual implementation date" on the RF1870 Change Request Form.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth to provide a separate release list containing any non system impacting documentation or process changes.</p>
	<p>Bernadette Seigler (AT&amp;T) also asked that a "joint agreement" be reached between AT&amp;T and BellSouth on the current performance of Change Control Statuses from both companies' perspective. BellSouth acknowledged that it would be willing to work together and jointly agree on the current performance.</p>
	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth to change the way it displays Implemented CR's on its website to separate by System Impacting, Documentation and Process.</p>

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p><b>FORMAT OF CCP MEETINGS</b></p> <p>Cheryl Storey (BST) discussed with the CLECs that BellSouth would like their input as to the current format of the CCP meetings. Discussion was also held about whether the CCP meetings should be face-to-face or by conference call. The general consensus was that the CCP meetings should move to an all day agenda because of the many issues that should be covered. Face-to-face meetings are beneficial and would be scheduled occasionally.</p> <p>Mel Wagner (Birch) discussed that after observing the Change Control process over time, it was apparent that the fundamental problems appear to be in the management of the process. He stated that the primary goal should be to get as much "flow-through" functionality through the Change Control process as possible. He addressed the fact that CLECs are calling meetings between themselves to position against BellSouth and also going to Commissions and the DOJ to discuss problems that are not being addressed by BellSouth through CCP. Mel stated that there appears to be a level of tension between CLECs and BellSouth and a lack of support from BellSouth on many issues that has prompted the CLECs to hold "outside" meetings. Mel made the following suggestions to further the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Having SME's/system experts available during CLEC Monthly Status Meetings</li><li>• The Change Control forum should be open to all entities within BellSouth to participate, including Account Team and Flow-Through Representation</li><li>• Overlapping issues need to be handled in sync, reducing the chance for issues to "go in circles"</li><li>• Overall advocacy for the customer</li><li>• Less confusing, simpler process</li></ul> <p>Mel Wagner also requested that BellSouth explain who is the owner of "Flow Thru" change requests.</p> <p>Mel Wagner asked BellSouth to provide a timeline as to when these issues can be addressed.</p> <p>Kyle Kopytchak (Network Tel) pointed out that the CLEC's first point of contact should be the Account Teams, however many times the CLECs are being told to carry their issues to Change Control.</p> <p>Valerie Cottingham commented that BellSouth has always made SME's available for Monthly Status Meetings upon CLEC requests, which is documented in the CCP process. Project Managers are also participants in meetings, if needed. A member of the Flow Through Task Force (FTTF) was asked to be available for this meeting. In addition, she explained that if it is indicated that a Change Request has moved to the Flow Through Task Force, then the Task Force will manage it, otherwise it will remain in Change Control. She also reiterated that Change Control is the CLECs' advocate and also strives to champion CLEC issues using this process.</p>

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p>Valerie also added that an invitation had been extended to Account Teams to attend the monthly status meetings.</p> <p>To further the discussion of the format of meetings, Cheryl Storey (BST) asked the CLECs if BellSouth should develop a process for prioritization by conference call – in lieu of traveling and would ask the CLECs to provide input.</p> <p><b>APPEAL PROCESS</b></p> <p>Brenda Files (BST) stated that BellSouth would like to propose that a documented “Appeal” process be added to the Change Control process document to deal with appeals of CR’s (i.e., validation responses, BellSouth cannot support). BellSouth will submit a Change Request to document this process, noting a response to an appeal in 7 days.</p>
	<p><b>ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth will submit a CR to document an “Appeal” process to be added to the CCP Document.</p>
	<p><b>LENS / CR0459</b></p> <p>Susan Hart (BST) gave a status on the correction of the PSO and LSF functionality relating to defect change request CR0459.</p> <p>Mel Wagner (Birch) stated that Project Managers, SME’s, and other experts should be available especially after new releases are implemented to avoid defect situations such as what prompted CR0459. He said that with respect to the improvement of performance in LENS, it was evident that defects resulted specifically the BTN, PSO and LSF issues. The BTN issue was corrected on 09/29/01.</p> <p>Susan Hart (BST) commented that the delay of the PSO fix was due to the large coding effort. At this time, BellSouth still does not have a definitive fix date for the LSF issue and Susan indicated that the LCSC is not receiving any requests from the CLECs for LSF to be provided. Mel Wagner indicated that Birch is requesting at least 20 LSF’s per month.</p> <p>Mel also indicated that he would like to see LENS added to the CAVE test environment. CLECs indicated they want a pre and post release evaluation. Susan Hart indicated that BellSouth currently performs testing of the LENS interface prior to a release.</p> <p>Bernadette Seigler (AT&amp;T) pointed out that there have been instances where the Business Rule field name definitions do not match the field names being displayed in LENS.</p>
	<p><b>ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth will investigate comparing the Business Rule field name definitions vs. what LENS field names are displaying.</p>

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<p><b>OTHER ISSUES</b></p> <p>Tyra Hush (MCI) discussed that currently BellSouth does not support "Billing" issues in the CCP. Tyra stated that this appeared to be contradictory to what is currently in the definition of what is in the scope of CCP.</p> <p>Valerie Cottingham explained that BellSouth Billing systems are managed through the OBF process. She said that billing changes are managed through Change Control if they apply to pre-ordering/ordering through the local interfaces.</p> <p><b>ACTION ITEM: (BellSouth)</b> BellSouth to provide clarification on the support of Billing issues through Change Control.</p>
<b>4. MONTHLY STATUS AGENDA</b>	<p>Due to lack of time, the Monthly Status Meeting portion of the agenda was not covered in this meeting.</p> <p>BellSouth did, however provide the Summary of Regulatory Mandates and the Monthly Release Report to the CLECs prior to the meeting.</p> <p>BellSouth asked if there were any questions regarding any specific CR's. Bill Grant (Telcordia) asked that BellSouth add a column to the supported interfaces matrix to reflect the Release number. BellSouth agreed.</p>
<p>(As a courtesy, the following information is provided, but was not covered in the meeting)</p> <p><b>5. REPORT OF SYSTEM OUTAGES</b></p> <p>NOTE: Details of each outage are posted on the Change Control website at <a href="http://www.interconnection.bellsouth.com/market/lec/ccp_live/ccp.html">www.interconnection.bellsouth.com/market/lec/ccp_live/ccp.html</a></p>	<p>The following Type 1 System outages/degradation have occurred since the last Status Meeting:</p> <p>LENS - 8</p> <p>EDI - 1</p> <p>TAG - 7</p> <p>CSOTS - 2</p> <p>EC-TA - 5</p> <p>TAFI - 0</p>
<b>6. UPCOMING MEETINGS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>October 25, 2001 - Release 10.2 User Requirements Review</li> <li>November 14, 2001 - Monthly Status Meeting (conference call)</li> </ul>
<b>7. SUMMARY OF NEW ACTION ITEMS</b>	<p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to provide a "real" example of the expiration of a TAG release with version numbers in the "Retirement of Versions" section of the CCP document. Text will be added to include that this expiration is not an "industry map".</p> <p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to investigate if it can include language in the Versioning policy re: evaluation of changes to a frozen map, such as correction of defects and regulatory changes.</p> <p><b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth will re-construct the 2002 schedule on the original release cycles and communicate back to the CLECs.</p>

October 24, 2001

## CCP Monthly Status/Process Improvement Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Items	Discussion
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth will investigate if it can offer another minor release replacing a major release in the 2002 Release Schedule.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> The CLECs request that a "revision history" be included in the BBR-LO companion matrix/grid document.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth will schedule a meeting with the CLECs to discuss the BBR-LO companion matrix document on October 31, 2001 at 10:00 am EST.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to investigate providing a revision history in the Pre-Order Business Rules document.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> Dennis Davis to provide BellSouth's sizing modeling concept to the CLECs within 2 weeks.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to provide a SME at the next monthly status meeting to support BellSouth's position on CR0424.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to investigate how the Change Request reporting format can be changed to create reports to be used as tracking tools.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to add an "actual implementation date" on the RF1870 Change Request Form.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to provide a separate release list containing any non system impacting documentation or process changes.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to change the way it displays Implemented CR's on its website to separate by System Impacting, Documentation and Process.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth will submit a CR to document an "Appeal" process to be added to the CCP Document.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth will investigate comparing the Business Rule field name definitions vs. what LENS field names are displaying.
	<b>NEW ACTION ITEM:</b> BellSouth to provide clarification on the support of Billing issues through Change Control.

